

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 8 are amended. Support for the amendment to claims 1 and 8 may be found at least at pages 5 and 6 of the specification. No new matter is added. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Paula at the interview held September 15, 2009, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 4 and 11 contain allowable subject matter.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-13 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,671,684 (Hull) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,397,194 (Houvener); rejects claims 7, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hull in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,751,779 (Bornstein); and rejects claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hull in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,533,822 (Kupiec). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed and generally agreed to during the personal interview, Applicants respectfully submit that Hull and Houvener fail to teach, and would not have rendered obvious, "the extracted lesser portions are itemized at least based on similar annotations," as recited in independent claims 1 and 8.

Applicants submit that Hull fails to teach the presently claimed itemizing of extracted lesser portions based on similarity. Hull is merely directed to a system that simultaneously

highlights a physical and electronic version of a document. Hull does not teach generating a summary and its attendant features, as claimed. Thus, Hull fails to teach each and every feature of the independent claims. Houvener is merely relied upon to allegedly teach features pertaining to an image output device. Furthermore, Houvener, Kupiec and Bornstein fail to cure the deficiencies of Hull.

Therefore, the applied references, taken alone or in any combination, fail to teach, and would not have rendered obvious, each and every feature of independent claims 1 and 8.

Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9, 10 and 12-20 depend from claims 1 and 8. Because the applied references fail to anticipate or render obvious the features recited in independent claims 1 and 8, dependent claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9, 10 and 12-20 are patentable for at least the reasons that claims 1 and 8 are patentable, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Smith Sirisakorn  
Registration No. 65,056

JAO:SZS/hms

Attachment:  
Request for Continued Examination

Date: September 23, 2009

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037
--